To: CN=Holly Ferguson/OU=CI/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Cc: CN=Lauren Drees/OU=CI/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Bcc: []
From: CN=Steve Vandegrift/OU=ADA/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Mon 8/13/2012 4:45:23 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: CLP RPDs for duplicates
Form 6-IN.pdf
Form 1A-IN.pdf
(embedded image)
(embedded image)

Holly-

I thought I understood what was going on with the dups but now I don't think I do. The email below from Lori talks about Ni, Sb and As but your email refers to J6 flags for Cr, Pb, and Ni. Is this for all three SDGs? I just talked to Rick and he said he didn't get an email to flag these metals. So I need some clarification on this. And these forms they attached, I can't find their equivalent in the SMO portal.

Steve

Steve Vandegrift, QA Manager
Ground Water and Ecosystems Restoration Division
NRMRL/ORD/USEPA
P.O. Box 1198
919 Kerr Research Dr.
Ada, OK 74820
(580)436-8684 (voice)
(580)436-8528 (fax)
vandegrift.steve@epa.gov

From: Holly Ferguson/CI/USEPA/US
To: Steve Vandegrift/ADA/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Lauren Drees/CI/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 08/08/2012 10:13 AM
Subject: Fw: CLP RPDs for duplicates

FYI - After reading what Lori sent me and reviewing the amended reports, I still thought that the RPD column on Report 6 was incorrect and that removing the * flags for Pb and Ni was incorrect according to the National Functional Guidelines. MichaelS Johnson called me before I was able to write Lori back, and he is sending my comments back through the system to get it all sorted out. Bottom line right now, Form 6 still needs some correcting by Chemtech, but the J6 flags we put on Cr, Pb, and Ni still stand.

Thank you,
Holly Ferguson, QA Manager
Environmental Technology Assessment, Verification and Outcomes Staff
NRMRL/ORD/USEPA
513-569-7944
----- Forwarded by Holly Ferguson/CI/USEPA/US on 08/08/2012 11:07 AM -----

From: Lori Maldini/DC/USEPA/US
To: Holly Ferguson/CI/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: MichaelS Johnson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 08/08/2012 09:04 AM
Subject: RPDs for duplicates

Hi Holly,

I received the below response from the laboratory regarding how RPDs were calculated for duplicates for Ni, Sb and As. Also, below are corrected forms 6 and 1A. Please let me know if you are having additional problems with RPD duplicates for any other analytes or any other issues. If need be, I can set up a conference call with SMO to answer your data validation questions. Thank you.

Hi Lori,

Regarding the RPD calculation issue involving ORD SDG MH3BQ1/Case 42753, SMO inquired for further information from the lab yesterday. The lab provided the following response:

LAB: "We have checked calculation for RPD in our reporting software and found out that for "Ni" reporting software has used negative absorbance (raw result) as -2.081 instead of "0" value for sample result. Therefor RPD for "Ni" calculated as 312 instead of 200. Please see below detail calculation for RPD for "Ni".

RPD = [[D-S]/[(D+S)/2]]*100
= [[9.5260-(-2.081)]/[(9.5260+(-2.081))/2]]*100
= [[11.607]/[3.7225]]*100
= 312

For Sb & As, RPD should not be calculated according to EPA SOW ISM01.3 Exhibit D Section 12, 12.7.4 (If both sample and duplicate values are less than the CRQL, the RPD is not calculated). Due to software error lab has reported RPD value as "0". RPD column should be "Blank" for Sb & As due to less than CRQL results for sample and duplicate.

RPD correction for "Ni" will remove "*" flag from Form 6 and therefor Form 1 will be corrected for "Ni" for "*" flag as well. We are going to correct Form 6 for Sb, As and Ni and Form 1 for "Ni" qualifier flag and will send to region as well as SMO. Revised Hard Copy PDF & corrected EDD will be submitted as "Additional Data" on SMO portal.

Regards
Lori Maldini
Inorganic (ISM) Program Manager- Contract Laboratory Program
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Solid Waste & Emergency Response
Office of Superfund Remediation & Technology Innovation
Analytical Services Branch

703-347-8834 (w)
703-603-9135 (fax)